

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested. No claims have been added or canceled. Claims 1, 4, 8 and 11 have been amended. Claims 1-18 stand rejected and are currently pending.

Rejections based on 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 7 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

With regards to claim 7, in paragraph [0041] of the specification, it states "Label file 118 should not be construed as limited to an actual file per se, but can be any output stream containing data. The data may include a stream of single characters or be composed of a series of data packets." Therefore, claim 7 contains subject matter which was described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

With regards to claim 8, the word "delineated" has been removed. However, in paragraph [0041], the types of file are described extensively.

For at least the reasons discussed above, Applicant respectfully requests allowance of claims 7 and 8.

Rejections based on 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

With regards to claim 1, the phrase “having a tangible component” has been added to overcome the rejection.

For at least the reasons discussed above, Applicant respectfully requests allowance of claim 1.

Rejections based on 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-7, 9-15, and 17-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Strangio (U.S. Patent Number 5,280,251).

With regards to claim 1, Strangio does not teach receiving search criteria for one or more cable-label records, wherein said cable-label records were previously stored in a storage component. Strangio discloses that a database may be searched for a corresponding cable type. A cable type is not the same as a cable-label record. A cable type is a physical characteristic of the cable. Furthermore, Strangio does not disclose anything about cable labels being stored in a database. Therefore, Strangio does not teach receiving search criteria for one or more cable-label records, wherein said cable-label records were previously stored in a storage component.

Strangio does not teach providing a data stream that when rendered by the printing device produces cable-label records displaying content of the identified records in a prescribed format. At col. 13, lines 23-26, Strangio discloses that label data is linked to cable information stored in a database. The recall of match data makes available label text. Strangio does not disclose how the label text gets to the printer. Strangio does not disclose a data stream that is delivered to a printer. Therefore, Strangio does not teach providing a data stream that when rendered by the printing device produces cable-label records displaying content of the identified records in a prescribed format.

For at least the reasons discussed above, claim 1 is not anticipated by Strangio.

Applicant respectfully requests allowance of claim 1.

Applicant submits that claim 2 is allowable at least by virtue of its dependency from allowable claim 1. Claim 3 is allowable at least by virtue of its dependency from allowable claim 2. Claim 4 is allowable at least by virtue of its dependency from allowable claim 3.

With regards to claims 5 and 13, Strangio does not teach assembling a query from the first and second search parameters. Strangio discloses that a wire-function database is accessed based on the connector types and an operator-entered electrical standard. Strangio does not disclose an assembling step. Therefore, Strangio does not teach assembling a query from the first and second search parameters.

For at least the reasons discussed above, claims 5 and 13 are not anticipated by Strangio. Applicant respectfully requests allowance of claims 5 and 13.

Applicant also submits that claim 5 is allowable at least by virtue of its dependency from allowable claim 3. Claim 6 is allowable at least by virtue of its dependency from allowable claim 5.

With regards to claim 7, Strangio does not teach the data stream includes an output file. Strangio discloses that the operator selects a print mode comprising one of four possibilities. An appropriate flag is set to specify what is to be printed. The selected information is transmitted to the printer. At not time does Strangio discloses an output file or that an output file is sent to the printer. Therefore, Strrangio does not teach the data stream includes an output file.

For at least the reasons discussed above, claim 7 is not anticipated by Strangio. Applicant respectfully requests allowance of claim 7.

With regards to claim 9, Strangio does not teach receiving search criteria for retrieving one or more cable-label records. As with claim 1, Strangio discloses that a database may be searched for a corresponding cable type. A cable type is not the same as a cable-label record. A cable type is a physical characteristic of the cable. Furthermore, Strangio does not disclose anything about cable labels being stored in a database. Therefore, Strangio does not teach receiving search criteria for retrieving one or more cable-label records.

Strangio does not teach providing a data stream that when rendered by the printing device produces cable-label records displaying content of the identified record(s) in a prescribed format. As with claim 1, at col. 13, lines 23-26, Strangio discloses that label data is linked to cable information stored in a database. The recall of match data makes available label text. Strangio does not disclose how the label text gets to the printer. Strangio does not disclose a data stream that is delivered to a printer. Therefore, Strangio does not teach providing a data stream that when rendered by the printing device produces cable-label records displaying content of the identified record(s) in a prescribed format.

For at least the reasons discussed above, claim 9 is not anticipated by Strangio. Applicant respectfully requests allowance of claim 9.

Applicant submits that claims 10 and 11 are allowable at least by virtue of their dependency from allowable claim 9. Claim 13 is allowable at least by virtue of its dependency from allowable claim 12 which is dependent from allowable claim 11. Claim 14 is allowable at least by virtue of its dependency from allowable claim 13.

With regards to claim 15, Strangio does not teach a user interface operationally coupled to a storage component for receiving a search string to query the storage component for one or more records. Strangio discloses opening an editing window but does not disclose the

editing window being coupled or connected to a database, memory, or storage component. Furthermore, Strangio does not disclose that the text entered or modified at the editing window is used to query a database, memory, or storage component. Therefore, Strangio does not teach a user interface operationally coupled to a storage component for receiving a search string to query the storage component for one or more records.

Strangio does not teach a cable-label records controller that receives the query result and converts the result into a prescribed format whereby the query result can be rendered on a printing device. Strangio discloses that printing of wiring data may take place at almost any time. Strangio further discloses that the appropriate flag is set within the program to specify what is to be printed, and the selected information is transmitted to the printer. Strangio does not disclose a controller that receives query results. The controller is not a program. Nor does Strangio disclose any conversion process in order for printing to occur. Therefore, Strangio does not teach a cable-label records controller that receives the query result and converts the result into a prescribed format whereby the query result can be rendered on a printing device.

For at least the reasons discussed above, claim 15 is not anticipated by Strangio. Applicant respectfully requests allowance of claim 15.

Applicant submits that claim 17 is allowable at least by virtue of its dependency from allowable claim 16 which is dependent from allowable claim 15.

With regards to claim 18, Strangio does not teach generating a cable-label records record in a structured format from the set of data. Strangio discloses that a disk database is made available to an operator to characterize and catalog the many types of cables. The disk database contains the stored continuity matrix, connector types, and other information corresponding to many different cables. However, Strangio does not disclose generating any record in a structured

format from the list of information. Strangio only identifies what is located in the disk database. Therefore, Strangio does not teach generating a cable-label records record in a structured format from the set of data.

For at least the reasons discussed above, claim 18 is not anticipated by Strangio. Applicant respectfully requests allowance of claim 18.

Rejections based on 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 8 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Strangio (U.S. Patent Number 5,280,251) as applied to claims 1 and 15 above, and further in view of Rojas et al (U.S. Patent Number 6,721,414 B1).

With regards to claims 8, Rojas does not teach the prescribed format includes at least one selection from the following: a binary file; an ASCII file; and a delineated text file, including a delimiter. With regards to claim 16, Rojas does not teach the prescribed format includes at least one selection from the following: an ASCII file; and a delimited text file. Combining the teachings of Rojas into Strangio would render Strangio inoperable, thus, there is no motivation to combine Strangio and Rojas. Rojas discloses a cable manager that includes import and export utilities which allow a user to transfer data into and out of cable manager in formats common to other programs or in a text file. Cable manager is a software module that operates on a computer to search and track telecommunication paths. Strangio discloses a multi-conductor cable tester which is a hardware device. Furthermore, neither Strangio nor Rojas disclose a printing device that produces a binary file, an ASCII file, or a text file. Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art would not be motivated to combine Rojas into Strangio because Strangio would be rendered inoperable; thus, Strangio and Rojas are not combinable.

Applicant also submits that claim 8 is allowable at least by virtue of its dependency from allowable claim 1. Claim 16 is allowable at least by virtue of its dependency from allowable claim 15.

In the Office Action dated March 2, 2006, the following additional references were provided: U.S. Publication 20050120196 A1 issued to Zito and U.S. Patent No. 5,021,968 A issued to Ferketic. These references have been overcome and do not disclose Applicant's claimed invention.

CONCLUSION

No fee is believed due in connection with this Amendment, but the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional amount required or to credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 21-0765.

Respectfully submitted,


Leonard Searcy, II
Reg. No. 53,574

LS/lc

SHOOK, HARDY, & BACON L.L.P.
2555 Grand Blvd.
Kansas City, MO 64108-2613
816/474-6550